United Nations S/PV.3413

Security Council
Forty-ninth Year

Provisional

3413th Meeting
Sunday, 31 July 1994, 11.55 a.m.
New York

President:	Mr. Marker	(Pakistan)
Members:	Argentina	Mr. Cárdenas
	Brazil	Mr. Sardenberg
	China	Mr. Li Zhaoxing
	Czech Republic	Mr. Rovensky
	Djibouti	Mr. Olhaye
	France	Mr. Ladsous
	New Zealand	Mr. Keating
	Nigeria	Mr. Ayewah
	Oman	Mr. Al-Khussaiby
	Russian Federation	Mr. Vorontsov
	Rwanda	
	Spain	Mr. Yáñez-Barnuevo
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Mr. Gomersall
	United States of America	Mrs. Albright

Agenda

The question concerning Haiti

Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Mission in Haiti (S/1994/828)

Report of the Secretary-General on the question of Haiti (S/1994/871)

94-86158 (E)

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, *within one week of the date of publication*, to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Section, room C-178.

The meeting was called to order at 11.55 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The question concerning Haiti

Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Mission in Haiti (S/1994/828)

Report of the Secretary-General on the question of Haiti (S/1994/871)

The President: I should like to inform the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Canada, Cuba, Haiti, Mexico, Uruguay and Venezuela, in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Longchamp (Haiti) took a place at the Council table; Mr. Malone (Canada); Mr. Rodriguez Parrilla (Cuba); Mr. Flores Olea (Mexico); Mr. Piriz Ballon (Uruguay); and Mr. Tejera Paris (Venezuela) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

The President: The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The Security Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

Members of the Council have the following documents before them: S/1994/828 and S/1994/828/Add.1, report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Mission in Haiti; S/1994/871, report of the Secretary-General on the question of Haiti; S/1994/905, letter dated 29 July 1994 from the Permanent Representative of Haiti to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General, transmitting the text of a letter of the same date from the President of the Republic of Haiti addressed to the Secretary-General; and S/1994/910, letter dated 30 July 1993 from the Permanent Representative of Haiti to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council.

Members of the Council also have before them document S/1994/904, which contains the text of a draft resolution submitted by Argentina, Canada, France and the United States of America.

The first speaker is the representative of Haiti and I now call on him.

Mr. Longchamp (Haiti) *(interpretation from French):* When, on the morning of 30 September 1991, the news of the coup d'état perpetrated by the Haitian military against the democratically elected President of that country became known, the reaction was immediate. In the wake of the emotion and indignation generated by this heinous act, the international community vigorously condemned this blow against democracy in Haiti, to the establishment of which it had greatly contributed by assisting in the holding of elections on 16 December 1990 - the first free and fair elections held in my country in nearly two centuries. Throughout the world, decisions were taken with a view to isolating the putschists, restoring the legitimate authorities to office and continuing the democratic process which President Aristide and his Government had begun and whose results were already starting to take shape.

Today, precisely 34 months after the beginning of that treacherous act by a power-hungry general, supported in his mad venture by a small minority opposing the permanent establishment of a State based on the rule of law in Haiti, we must acknowledge that the situation has not changed: the putschists continue to control the country and to subjugate the population, President Aristide is still in exile, and the international community is still calling for his return in vain.

It is true that commendable initiatives have been taken with a view to resolving this crisis. The international community has spared no effort to help find a solution to this situation; many initiatives to this end have been taken, at great cost. The Organization of American States (OAS) first of all and then the United Nations adopted measures directed towards resolving this crisis by diplomatic means. Apart from the resolutions of the Ad Hoc Committee of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the OAS on Haiti, we have in mind the mediation efforts of the former Foreign Minister of Colombia, Mr. Ramírez Ocampo, which led to the Port-au-Prince, Caracas and Cartagena de las Indias

meetings and to the signing of the Washington Agreement of 29 January 1992.

Our Organization, for its part, has adopted many resolutions, one of which authorized the deployment of a United Nations-OAS civilian mission. On the basis of the report of the Secretary-General, the Security Council initially made the embargo on oil products and weapons and ammunition universal and binding.

For its part, the legitimate Government made many concessions, with the sole aim of enabling the country to rise from the abyss into which the irresponsible current leaders of the Haitian army hurled it.

All those efforts were met by the obstinate refusal of the military putschists to retreat from the political arena and let democratic progress prevail once more. With their position bolstered by the mixed signals sent from certain quarters, they have totally ignored the repeated appeals and decisions of the international community, which indicates their determination not to give up the power they usurped.

A year ago, on 3 July 1993, after long and difficult negotiations led by the Special Representative of the Secretaries-General of the United Nations and the Organization of American States (OAS), Mr. Dante Caputo, an agreement was signed, opening the way to a peaceful settlement of the crisis. The 10-point Governors Island Agreement embodied all the elements that could lead to the restoration of constitutional order and lay the structural foundations for the permanent establishment of democracy in Haiti. It provided for dialogue between the various political views represented in Parliament, the formation of a government of national concord, a programme of international cooperation, the granting of amnesty by the President of the Republic, the creation of a new police force distinct from the army, the retirement of the commander of the armed forces and accompanying reform of the armed forces, and the return to Haiti of President Aristide. All those provisions were to have been implemented before 30 October 1993; the United Nations and the OAS were to verify that implementation.

While President Aristide has done everything in his power to respect the commitments undertaken at Governors Island, that is not true of the Commander-in-Chief of the armed forces of Haiti, who has employed constant obstacles and delaying tactics to prevent complete implementation. Making use of armed civilians, and at times operating themselves, the military has created a climate of terror in Haiti, not conducive to the peaceful transition called for in the Governors Island Agreement. Hence, the United Nations Mission in Haiti (UNMIH) could not be deployed, and the Minister of Justice, who was preparing to present to Parliament the draft law on the separation of the police and the army, was murdered in cold blood. President Aristide was unable to return to the country as planned on 30 October 1993.

Despite the Security Council's reimposition and strengthening of sanctions in order to compel the military leadership to respect its commitments, no progress has been made to that end. To the contrary, in recent months the military regime has become harder; it has increased repression and taken measures to limit civil liberties. Human rights violations have increased considerably. A state of emergency has been declared in Haiti.

At the same time, the military has been increasing its defiance of the international community, installing a provisional President and expelling the International Civilian Mission (MICIVIH). Moreover, the illegal, illegitimate Government is preparing to hold legislative and presidential elections.

I need hardly say that the attitude of the military putschists is thwarting the complete implementation of the Governors Island Agreement and the consequent end to the crisis, which the international community desires with all its heart and towards which it has made so many efforts. The ongoing situation is only exacerbating the destruction of the country and increasing the suffering of the people, who have no recourse but to flee the country in any way they can, thus creating a refugee problem for the entire region.

In the present situation, we believe additional measures are necessary to put an end to the delaying tactics and arrogance of the military leadership, which pose a direct threat to the authority of the Security Council.

We believe that the draft resolution before the Security Council today contains elements that will enable the international community to respond appropriately to the challenge issued by a handful of unscrupulous soldiers who for more than three years have been contributing to the destruction of their own country.

An agreement is a contract. Those who sign it must respect it or pay the price. The President of the Republic of Haiti, despite profound reservations, signed the

Governors Island Agreement. But, while history has shown that his reservations were well founded, he has scrupulously respected that Agreement. He has done so not only out of respect for the international community, the Haitian people and the office he holds, but also, and in particular, because of his conviction that the Agreement is the only way for the Haitian nation to defend and recover its national sovereignty: as article 58 of the Haitian Constitution puts it,

> "National sovereignty resides in the entirety of the citizens".

By requesting the help of the international community to solve the Haitian crisis, we are sharing with it our dream that all our compatriots should be united in the exercise of the prerogatives of their sovereignty to decide the future of their country.

By stating the consent of the Government of President Aristide to the draft resolution before the Council, we are calling on the international community, through you, Mr. President, to join with us in defending our national sovereignty.

We invite the international community to respect us and to respect our national sovereignty, not only because of who we are and what we represent, but also because of who the members of the international community are and what they represent for the establishment of a new world political order.

The President: The next speaker is the representative of Mexico. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Flores Olea (Mexico) *(interpretation from Spanish):* Since the beginning of the crisis in Haiti, Mexico has vigorously spoken out against the coup d'état and the violations of constitutional order that culminated in the overthrow of the legitimate Government of President Jean-Bertrand Aristide.

Since that time, Mexico has supported the decisions of the international community aimed at restoring legality in Haiti, particularly the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, the Governors Island Agreement and the New York Pact.

Mexico maintains also that the restoration of the constitutional democratic order in Haiti and, hence, the return of President Aristide should come about through a peaceful solution achieved by dialogue and negotiation, with the support of the international community and in the framework of the commitments undertaken by the parties concerned.

The international community, through the Security Council, adopted sanctions, which it recently strengthened. The military leadership of the de facto Government not only has rejected the appeals of the international community but has resisted the sanctions. But there are signs that these are beginning to have their effect; they should therefore be given enough time to produce the desired results. For that reason Mexico has doubts about the timeliness of the draft resolution before the Council today and profoundly regrets that the Security Council has decided that it is necessary to have recourse to the use of force to resolve the crisis in Haiti. The use of force in this case gives rise to grave legal and practical doubts, and we must not forget that history - from which we still have much to learn - has shown that military intervention in our hemisphere has invariably been traumatic; it has desolated cities, harmed and demoralized civilians, aroused historical resentment and, despite its high cost, not necessarily attained its objective.

The measures included in the draft resolution are derived from the report submitted by the Secretary-General. We find it unfortunate that this report does not contain a full political expression of, or even a reference to the option of persevering in political and diplomatic efforts. Even more seriously, the report recognizes that the Organization is not able to assume the role it should in an action of this kind. The draft resolution clearly reflects this inability.

Accordingly, the actions proposed in the draft resolution are not, strictly speaking, provided for in the Charter. Indeed, the crisis in Haiti, in our opinion, is not a threat to peace, a breach of the peace or an act of aggression such as would warrant the use of force in accordance with Article 42 of the Charter. The foundation for the actions proposed, as can be seen from the report of the Secretary-General, appears to be previous practice, that is, precedent. Every situation, however, is different. In this case, the international community and the draft resolution itself have emphasized the exceptional nature of the Haitian case. Therefore, it seems at the least contradictory to insist on the one hand on this unique character and, on the other, to cite precedents and concepts applied in other circumstances and in other geographical areas. The relevance of these precedents in the case of Haiti

therefore appears to be highly questionable, since this case is very different and quite singular.

It is also troubling that the draft resolution does not contain any reference to the time-frame for the proposed action. In other words, a kind of carte blanche has been awarded to an undefined multinational force to act when it deems it to be appropriate. This seems to us an extremely dangerous practice in the field of international relations.

Moreover, unfortunately, the draft resolution makes scarcely any reference to long-term needs in terms of institutional reconstruction and economic and social development in Haiti and lacks the specific recommendations that would have been desirable in this regard. It could be said that the Security Council is not competent to make such recommendations, but we believe that it should invite the competent bodies of the United Nations system to adopt the necessary measures to this end.

This is not an insignificant point. The restoration of democracy in Haiti will be impossible to achieve by military means alone, which will be all the more traumatic if not accompanied by an extraordinary reconstruction effort.

The Security Council has since the beginning of this matter been acting at the request of the lawful Government. Now President Aristide is not opposed to the use of force to re-establish his rights and the rights of the Haitian people. There should also be a major international effort committed to the development of the Haitian people.

Mexico is well aware of the existing difficulties and of the need to restore constitutional order and democracy in Haiti. Mexico also believes, however, that there are not sufficient elements to justify the use of force and, still less, to justify across-the-board authorization for the action of ill-defined multinational forces. My country would of course prefer that every opportunity still be given to the sanctions to produce the desired effects. Even if this draft resolution is adopted, an attempt should be made to have some new procedure or mechanism of an imaginative nature that might still produce political results and which might save the region, and primarily the people of Haiti, from the violence and suffering which, in any case, armed intervention will bring about.

In other words, the continuation of political and diplomatic efforts to achieve solutions consistent with the Charter continue, in our opinion, to be the best alternative to bring about the return of constitutional law and the exercise of free self-determination for the Haitian people.

The President: I now invite the representative of Cuba to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Rodriguez Parrilla (Cuba) *(interpretation from Spanish):* I wish to thank the Council for the opportunity given to me to express the position of a State Member of the United Nations on an extremely important issue. I must acknowledge that the circumstances in which this formal meeting of the Council have been convened do not facilitate the exercise of this right.

Cuba has always supported the people of Haiti in our shared history and culture because of the many points of contact between us. We understand the profound suffering of our Haitian brothers and the bitter trials undergone by their legitimate authorities, elected by popular vote. We express the complete support of our country for the constitutional President, Jean-Bertrand Aristide, who embodies the will of his people.

We feel that in the circumstances, the countries of Latin America and the Caribbean have an enormous historical responsibility, a responsibility that they share, I think, overwhelmingly, with the members of the Security Council who come from our region.

That is why we attach the utmost importance to the meeting of the Latin American and Caribbean Group held only 72 hours ago, because we believe that, in its consideration of this matter, the Security Council will give real weight to the opinion of States Members of the United Nations from this continent.

It is not our priority now to explain our grave concern about the actual text of the draft resolution or with the relevant reports of the Secretary-General; nor with the formulation that describes the situation in Haiti as a threat to regional peace and security, something that is new and removed from the precepts established by the Charter of the United Nations concerning the authority of the Security Council. Neither do we wish to express our opinions about the extemporaneous forms and the stereotypes that are used as precedents in paragraph 4 of the draft; or the misuse of Chapter VII of the Charter as contained in this draft; nor with the omission of the fact that the return of President Aristide, the constitutional

President, is a prerequisite for the restoration of democratic order.

It is alarming to see the absolute lack of any time-limits for the operation, a fundamental omission that prevents any objective analysis of the dimensions and the true scope of the operations being sought.

In fact, what has prompted me to take the floor is the need to explain the position of my country concerning this "Chronicle of an Invasion Foretold".

The history of Haiti did not begin with the military coup d'état of September 1991. What were its causes? Who are these putchists, and where do they come from?

The de facto military regime is the expression of a dictatorship created, supported and financed for decades by the United States. The coup was the result of that same policy.

To the question of how it is possible for the military leaders involved in the coup to remain in power, challenging the international community and rendering their sanctions ineffective, there is only one reply: those leaders are receiving mixed messages from different power centres in the country in which we now find ourselves.

This resolution endorses military intervention, whether multinational or perhaps inter-American, as is mentioned in some of the documents. We wish to reiterate that Cuba considers that all avenues for finding a peaceful solution to the Haitian conflict have not been yet explored.

A military intervention under a different guise would be unheard-of in our Latin American and Caribbean history - which, sadly, is a lengthy history of military interventions - and could never have and does not have the consensus agreement of the States of our region, particularly in this so-called new post-cold-war era.

Cuba wishes to reiterate that, in principle, it is resolutely opposed to military intervention as a means of solving internal conflicts. History has shown that military operations cannot truly resolve internal conflicts for the simple reason that they cannot resolve the causes of those conflicts. Decisions of this nature go beyond the mandate of the Security Council, in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter, which only authorizes such powers in cases of an express threat to international peace and security.

The mechanisms for the peaceful settlement of disputes contained in the Charter must be retained, because a world policy that is sustained by the use of force is absolutely infeasible and extremely dangerous to international peace and security.

If anything might signify in and of itself a fundamental threat to peace and security, it is military action of this kind in the Caribbean region. Indeed, the actions taken prior to this one - the deployment of large-scale forces, modern means of combat and military exercises - are provoking instability in neighbouring States.

We must warn of the threat to the security and sovereignty of Cuba posed by this military deployment in a theatre of operations that involves our country through the presence of the United States Military Base at Guantánamo, which usurps our territory in violation of the rights and the will of our people and Government.

For all these reasons, and because of our commitment to Latin America and to the principles of non-intervention and non-use of force or threat of force, Cuba wishes to express its opposition to this draft resolution.

The President: The next speaker is the representative of Uruguay. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Piriz-Ballon (Uruguay) *(interpretation from Spanish)*: For my delegation, Sir, to congratulate you on the success with which you have presided over the work of the Security Council throughout this month is not a mere formality, but a sincere expression of our gratitude for your well-known talent and experience.

I wish to express my delegation's appreciation for the opportunity to participate in this debate. My country, a Founding Member of the United Nations and an enthusiastic participant in its work, could not be absent today, and I would like now to explain why we have asked for this opportunity to be heard.

Two fundamental principles have governed the foreign policy of Uruguay throughout its history: the principles of non-intervention and of the peaceful settlement of disputes - the latter a concept incorporated in the Constitution of the Republic of Uruguay. The universal validity of these principles and their constant consolidation in relations between States are the

unrelenting objectives of our foreign policy. Our position on this is complemented by another fundamental principle that Uruguay has traditionally upheld: that of the rule of international law. The interrelationship between these principles shapes our analysis of the various international situations and conflicts and guides our defence of the interests of the Republic of Uruguay and - we are convinced - of the international community as a whole.

Therefore, whenever, in this forum, the application of Chapter VII of the Charter has been considered in situations where, in our opinion, the necessary conditions for its application were not clearly present, Uruguay has always expressed its position unambiguously. Our invariable compliance with the principles we have named has always prompted us to support and advocate a restrictive view of the application of the enforcement measures provided for in the Charter. Thus although - with a view to the restoration of law, order and democracy in a fraternal nation - we have unswervingly supported the imposition of economic sanctions in accordance with Article 41 of the Charter, we do not support the application of military action provided for in Article 42. We do not believe that the internal political situation in Haiti projects externally in such a way as to represent a threat to international peace and security. Moreover, we believe that the search for a peaceful solution has not been exhausted. This is precisely the objective of the application of sanctions against the dictatorship which is so unjustly afflicting the Haitian people.

For these reasons, Uruguay stresses on the need to pursue avenues of dialogue and negotiation which have still not been exhausted. We wish to reiterate explicitly, in the framework of a restrictive interpretation of the principle of non-intervention, that Uruguay will not support any military intervention in the fraternal Republic of Haiti, whether it be of a unilateral or multilateral nature.

Without prejudice to this position, my country pledges its support for all measures directed towards restoring and strengthening democracy in the fraternal Republic of Haiti by peaceful means.

The President: I thank the representative of Uruguay for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Canada. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Malone (Canada) *(interpretation from French):* It is with great sadness but also with a sense of urgency that the delegation of Canada is once again addressing the Security Council on the situation in Haiti.

The international community has worked hard to convince the illegal authorities to relinquish their stranglehold on Haiti. The Council has adopted several decisions towards that end. The military leadership, however, has shown its determination to cling to power at any cost to the general population. It has further demonstrated its utter disregard for the United Nations and the Organization of American States with its recent expulsion of the staff of the International Civilian Mission, whose valuable work and courage Canada salutes.

(spoke in English)

From the outset of the Haitian crisis, the United Nations has sought to restore democracy in that country through mediation and other diplomatic means as well as through a gradually more severe set of sanctions. Canada has supported and participated in these efforts at every step, as one of the Secretary-General's "Friends of Haiti".

Canada has throughout the crisis stood at the side of the democratically elected President of Haiti, Jean-Bertrand Aristide, whose restoration we see as a key element of the restoration of democracy in that country. We note his appeal to the international community, in his letter to the Secretary-General of the United Nations dated July 29, for swift and determined action under the authority of the United Nations in order to permit the implementation of the Governors Island Agreement.

Canada had very much hoped and expected that the Governors Island Agreement would be implemented in full. Many efforts have been expended by this Council and by the international community towards achieving that goal. Because living conditions in Haiti continue to decline seriously and brutal repression continues, we cannot allow the *status quo* to persist. It is for this reason that the Government of Canada has co-sponsored the draft resolution before us.

Canada's commitment to restoring democracy in Haiti is unwavering. Canada has participated in the United Nations Mission in Haiti (UNMIH) in the past and will do so again when the operation is reconstituted under the terms of the draft resolution before us. The exact

nature of Canada's involvement in the second phase of this mandate is under discussion with the Secretariat and other potential contributing States. We look forward to the day very soon when UNMIH will deploy and when President Aristide returns to Haiti.

The President: The next speaker is the representative of Venezuela. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Tejera Paris (Venezuela) *(interpretation from Spanish):* Venezuela, in accordance with its constitutional principles and the foundations of its foreign policy, wishes to reiterate its commitment to the restoration of democracy in Haiti by peaceful means. To that end, Venezuela has participated in the Group of Friends of the Secretary-General of the United Nations for Haiti and will continue, within that Group, to promote a stable and lasting solution to the Haitian crisis.

The Government of Venezuela, faithful to its unswerving tradition of defending the principle of non-intervention, cannot support unilateral or multilateral military actions in any nation of the hemisphere, nor can it interfere with the sovereign will of any country.

The Government of Venezuela believes, however, that not all the means of finding a peaceful solution to the situation in Haiti have been exhausted, and to that end has been exploring various alternatives that will make possible the restoration of democracy to Haiti, an end to the sanctions, the reconstruction of the Haitian economy, and the opening of new prospects for the well-being of a people to which we are bound by historical ties we cannot ignore.

We trust that, even after the Security Council takes its decision, this organization of peace which is the United Nations will pursue with ever-greater commitment any chance of ensuring the implementation of the Governors Island Agreement by peaceful means and the restoration to Haiti of its legitimate Government, led by President Aristide.

Those who have usurped power in Haiti, who signed but have not complied with the Governors Island Agreement, and who have allowed the sanctions to punish the poor cruelly while others grow rich still have time to demonstrate some hint of patriotism or some modicum of charity. They can still avoid the suffering of intensified sanctions and the dark threat of a military operation. They can still withdraw and allow the Haitian people to see before them the joys of peace and the prospects of assistance for the reconstruction of their economy and the fabric of their society.

We associate ourselves with the efforts which you, Mr. President, can make to ensure that an operation of war is forestalled by an operation of peace, the funds for which increase alongside those foreseen for an intervention and the effects of which will go down in history as one of the most brilliant actions taken by the United Nations and will negate the humiliation of imposed punishment and the tragedy of the dead and the wounded that it will entail.

The President: It is my understanding that the Council is ready to proceed to vote on the draft resolution before it. Unless I hear any objection, I shall put the draft resolution to the vote.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

I shall first call on those members of the Council who wish to make statements before the voting.

Mr. Sardenberg (Brazil): At the outset, the Brazilian Government would like to express its recognition of the efforts the Secretary-General and his Special Representative have made, along with the Security Council, towards a solution to the crisis that has stricken the Haitian nation.

Brazil has repeatedly conveyed, in both the United Nations and the Organization of American States (OAS), its ongoing concern over the situation in Haiti. In this connection, it has supported all the resolutions adopted by those bodies that condemn the atmosphere of blatant violence and the obdurate violation of human rights in that sister country, to the detriment of the Haitian people and in defiance of the manifest will of the international community.

Brazil strongly supports the restoration of democracy in Haiti. We also consider that the crisis in that country is of a unique and exceptional character and cannot be put on a par with other situations in which international peace and security have been threatened. This is a matter which must be considered under the dual approach of strengthening democracy in the hemisphere and of the principles enshrined in both the United Nations and the OAS charters.

Therefore, it is essential to respect not only the democratic solidarity which we have built in our region,

but also the personality, sovereignty and independence of the States within it. We have been able to live in peace and cooperation in the region because we strictly observe the principles of the peaceful settlement of disputes and non-intervention. These principles and values constitute a whole - indivisible, harmonious and balanced.

In Brazil the Constitution establishes, in Article 4, the principles which both guide and limit the conduct of our international relations. Among these principles are the observance of human rights, the self-determination of peoples, non-intervention, equality among States and peaceful settlement of disputes. The OAS Charter, which clearly expresses the adherence of the countries of the region to representative democracy, affirms with equal clarity, in Article 2(b), that the Organization has an essential purpose

> "to promote and consolidate representative democracy with due respect for the principle of non-intervention."

We must bear in mind the legal tradition of Latin America and at the same time the present political circumstances of the region. Historically, the Latin American and Caribbean States have distinguished themselves by the positive contribution they have made to the progress of international law and to the preservation of peace and security. We have paved the way to becoming the first inhabited region of the world free of nuclear weapons, and we strongly favour disarmament. Today Latin America has the lowest military expenditures of the world and the lowest potential for tensions and armed conflicts. We uphold economic and political freedom, dialogue as a means to overcome differences and progressive convergence and integration among our nations.

Brazil considers that the draft resolution before us is not felicitous in the invocation of the criteria and the choice of means for attaining the goal of restoring democracy and reinstating the legitimately elected Government of Haiti under President Jean-Bertrand Aristide.

The situation in Haiti would warrant an expansion of the present United Nations Mission in Haiti (UNMIH) in order to implement fully the ideas originating from resolution 933 (1994), along the lines of the first option outlined in the Secretary-General's report of 15 July this year. This option was put aside, perhaps too hastily, on the grounds that it would require some additional time to take shape, the very time that could allow the sanctions to yield the desired effects. In that way we would have taken a more robust action, within the framework of a gradual process, where we would have employed the dissuasive means that are still available to us.

Brazil, as a member of the Security Council from the Latin American and Caribbean region and as the current Secretary of the Rio Group, deems it to be its duty not only to keep the countries of the region informed but also to take their concerns into due account. From the intensive consultations undertaken with our neighbours and friends, it has become clear that there is no consensus among them as to the action proposed today.

We consider it indispensable that consultations be held among all members of the Council and the parties directly or indirectly concerned with a given situation, in order to enhance the legitimacy and the effectiveness of the Council's decisions. Particularly in the case of Haiti, in view of its unique nature, such a consideration should have been paramount among our concerns.

For the first time in history the Security Council is holding a discussion on the use of force under Chapter VII in connection with a country of the Western Hemisphere. This is an issue of the utmost seriousness for all countries of the region. I should stress, in addition, that the Council is dealing with a fast-evolving problem. Just a few days ago our working assumptions changed dramatically. The issue then under discussion was the formation of a reconfigured United Nations peace-keeping force which would be deployed with the aim of assisting in the recovery of Haiti once the de facto authorities had left. Quite recently, however, the focus of our work shifted to the issue of the immediate establishment of a multinational force with the purpose of intervening in Haiti.

Due to this abrupt shift, Brazil sees serious difficulties in the draft resolution before the Council. Operative paragraph 4, in particular, contains language similar to that in resolution 678 (1990) regarding the Gulf War. That was a situation of a totally distinct political and legal nature, in a different political and regional context resulting from the invasion of one country by another, an act which gave rise at the time to the strongest reaction by the international community.

It is our view that the short time available to us was not sufficient for the full consideration of the vast, complex and unpredictable implications of the situation in

Haiti. The risks involved, not only for the Haitian people but also for the international community, should not be underestimated. For that very reason, the defence of democracy should always be consistent with principles governing relations between States and does not entail the recourse to force under the terms now being considered. These terms constitute a worrisome departure from the principles and customary practices adopted by the United Nations as regards peace-keeping.

Brazil will abstain in the voting. As we proceed, we direct our thoughts to the suffering Haitian people, which must remain at the core of our preoccupation. In reacting to violence, the international community should avoid the generation of more violence.

Mr. Li Zhaoxing (China) *(interpretation from Chinese):* Since the eruption of the crisis in Haiti the Chinese delegation has been following closely the development of the situation there. We sympathize deeply with the Haitian people in its present plight. We support the tireless efforts of the Secretary-General, his Special Envoy, the Organization of American States and the Latin American countries in seeking a political solution to the problem in Haiti, and we hope that the efforts of the international community will be conducive to a peaceful solution to the problem. On the basis of this position, the Chinese delegation has voted in favour of the previous Security Council resolutions on this question, including support for the economic sanctions against Haiti, although we are deeply concerned over the resulting suffering of the Haitian people.

The Chinese delegation shares the view that the problem of Haiti constitutes an element of instability in the region and understands the concern shown by numerous countries in the region over the prolonged lack of a solution to the problem. We therefore endorse greater peaceful efforts on the part of the international community, especially the countries of the region, to facilitate an appropriate solution to the problem through political means.

However, we cannot agree to the provision in the draft resolution before us concerning the authorization for Member States to adopt mandatory means under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter to resolve the problem of Haiti. As always, China advocates a peaceful solution to any international disputes or conflicts through patient negotiations. China does not agree with the adoption of any means of solution based on the resort to pressure at will or even the use of force.

The Chinese delegation is of the view that resolving problems such as that of Haiti through military means does not conform with the principles enshrined in the United Nations Charter and lacks sufficient and convincing grounds. The practice of the Council's authorizing certain Member States to use force is even more disconcerting because this would obviously create a dangerous precedent. We have noted that many Member States, particularly those in the Latin American region, have identical or similar views.

For these reasons, the Chinese delegation will abstain in the voting on the draft resolution before us.

The Chinese delegation wishes to take this opportunity to emphasize that we have held all along that dialogue and negotiation are the only appropriate and effective means to resolve the various international issues today, that the resort to pressure at will, sanctions and, above all, the use of force does not contribute to a fundamental solution and runs counter to the post-cold-war international trend towards widespread efforts to resolve disputes and conflicts through peaceful negotiations.

Once again, the Chinese delegation urges the parties concerned in Haiti to cooperate fully with the international community and the United Nations by faithfully implementing the Governors Island Agreement and the relevant Security Council resolutions so as to create the conditions for an early restoration of peace and stability in Haiti and avoid any further deterioration of the situation in the country.

Mr. Ayewah (Nigeria): On this, Sir, your last day in office as President of the Security Council during the month of July, I wish to extend to you the courtesies of the Nigerian delegation. It has been a momentous month, full of activities in the area of crisis management and conflict resolution. You have without a doubt acquitted yourself well in the discharge of your responsibilities.

My delegation is grateful to the Secretary-General for his recent reports on Haiti. We are deeply concerned at the continued deterioration of the situation in that country. In the words of the Secretary-General,

> "The general situation in Haiti has deteriorated to an intolerable extent", *(S/1994/828, para. 24)*

most of all for the vulnerable section of the population, the unintended victims of the regime of international sanctions.

It is the view of my delegation that the long-term international commitment and involvement envisaged for post-conflict Haiti in the Secretary-General's report should be applied to equally deserving situations elsewhere. The Council should bear in mind that the search for peace and the process of reconstruction and rehabilitation in those other places are no less complicated nor less deserving of long-term international commitment. My delegation will not relent in drawing attention to the need for the Security Council to adopt a single standard in terms of contingency planning, deployment of adequate levels of troops for peace-keeping operations in conflict areas, as well as continuing international commitment to post-conflict stability in those places.

With regard to the draft resolution before us, we wish first of all to emphasize the Nigerian Government's commitment to the broad objectives of the international community with respect to Haiti. Hence, my delegation has been consistent in its support for all previous Security Council resolutions and presidential statements on Haiti. In all these, we were guided by our obligations under the United Nations Charter to help promote and preserve international peace and security and by our concern for the welfare of the people in Haiti. We were also guided by considerations which took into account the views of Member States in the region.

None the less, it must noted that the draft resolution that is now before the Council takes us to another, entirely new level of external action to deal with the situation in Haiti and also to an entirely new territory in the Charter of the United Nations, in particular the use of Chapter VII. That is why my delegation has reacted to it with the greatest caution. However, we are delighted that several of our concerns have been addressed in the final draft of this resolution. For the record, my delegation would like to restate them.

First, we believe that in whatever we do here in the Security Council, the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Haiti should not be compromised. Respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Member States is the minimum basis of association by Members of the United Nations Organization. It should be observed in the case of all nations.

Secondly, my delegation's understanding is that any collective action authorized in the draft resolution is country-specific. We reaffirm the special character of the present situation in Haiti. The adoption of the draft resolution should therefore not be seen as a global license for external interventions through the use of force or any other means in the internal affairs of Member States. For my delegation, the overriding rationale for the proposed action under Chapter VII in the draft resolution is predicated on the failure of the military Government in Haiti to honour the Governors Island Agreement, which it freely entered into with the ousted President Aristide, and the military Government's failure to fully implement extant Security Council resolutions, both of which failures threaten peace and security in the region.

The adoption of this resolution by the Security Council should not be considered or construed as an abandonment of our collective faith in the efficacy of diplomatic means and/or sanctions to help solve the problems in Haiti and elsewhere. We continue to believe that international sanctions may work if given more time and provided there is the necessary political will. In any case, we would like to draw the Council's attention to the fact that there are no quick fixes for solving complex internal political problems anywhere, and in particular in the developing countries.

With regard to the operation of the multinational force, we hope that it will be a temporary one that is focused and subject-specific, and that the second phase of operations to be undertaken by the United Nations Mission in Haiti will commence soon enough so that the process of rehabilitation and reconstruction can begin in earnest.

In conclusion, having expressed our concerns and our reservations, my delegation will support this draft resolution. We hope that its adoption will advance the prospect of peace in Haiti and lay the foundations for a durable structure of representative Government in that country.

The President: I thank the representative of Nigeria for the very kind words he addressed to me.

I shall now put to the vote the draft resolution contained in document S/1994/904.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour:

Argentina, Czech Republic, Djibouti, France, New Zealand, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Brazil, China

The President: There were 12 votes in favour, none against and 2 abstentions. The draft resolution has been adopted as resolution 940 (1994).

I shall now call on those members of the Council who wish to make statements following the voting.

Mrs. Albright (United States of America): This historic resolution authorizes Member States to use all necessary means to restore legitimate, constitutional authority to Haiti. In so doing, it brings to a climax the Council's effort to restore democracy to the Haitian people, from whom it was stolen 34 long months ago. The resolution builds on earlier actions designed to relieve suffering in Haiti and promote the rule of law.

The Council has pursued patiently a peaceful and just end to the Haitian crisis. The Organization of American States (OAS) has pursued a parallel effort. Member States, including my own, have taken steps independently to encourage the illegitimate leaders to leave. Together, we, the international community, have tried condemnation, persuasion, isolation and negotiation. At Governors Island, we helped broker an agreement that the military's leader signed but refused to implement. We have imposed sanctions, suspended them, reimposed them and strengthened them. We have provided every opportunity for the de facto leaders in Haiti to meet their obligations.

But patience is an exhaustible commodity. The democratically elected Government of Haiti was overthrown almost three years ago. The vast majority of the Haitian people have suffered cruelly under the illegal regime. The usurpers now wielding power have brazenly murdered political opponents; they have sown terror among the poor; they have gone back on their word; they have created a puppet show and called it a government; they have expelled monitors sent by the United Nations and the OAS to observe human rights; and they have shunned the path of reconciliation based on law.

The status quo in Haiti is neither tenable nor acceptable. Choices must be made. And, although the situation in Haiti is complex, the choice is as simple as the choice between right and wrong. Today, the Council has made the right choice: in favour of democracy, law, dignity and relief from suffering long endured and never deserved.

And the Council's message to General Cedras, General Biamby and Colonel François is a simple one: "You too have a choice. You can depart voluntarily and soon, or you can depart involuntarily and soon. The sun is setting on your ruthless ambition. And on the near horizon, the light of a new dawn for Haiti can already be discerned".

There are those who argue that democracy is not possible in Haiti and that the majority of the people there should accept repression and grinding poverty as their fate. These gloomy counselors urge us not to act, knowing that if we accept their advice, we will also confirm their prophecies. For if we sit on the sidelines, we can be certain that in Haiti the terror, the desperation, the flight, the instability, the criminality and the injustice will go on and on.

My Government has a more positive view. We do not underestimate Haiti's economic and social difficulties, but we are not about to write off a whole society, especially one so close to our shores. Our generation has seen freedom shatter the limits of past possibility, from Eastern Europe to South-East Asia to Central America to South Africa. We know that free elections are possible in Haiti, because the current President is a product of one. We know that Haitian freedom has heroes and martyrs, from Toussaint to Malary, to the many hundreds this year who have perished or who have been tortured or raped simply for exercising basic rights.

We know that Haiti's culture is rich, its pride great, its people imbued with energy and courage. When the military leaders have gone and the burden of sanctions has been lifted, a new beginning will be made. The climate for political reconciliation will improve. The military will be trained to serve the people, not abuse them. We and others will provide a large influx of

economic and technical aid. Old debts will be cleared. New public and private investments will create jobs. As time passes, Haitians will once again be able to put food on the table for their children and families.

Let us be clear. Our purpose is not to impinge upon the sovereignty of Haiti, but to restore the power to exercise that sovereignty to those who rightfully possess it. Our purpose is to enable Haiti, in the words of the United Nations Charter, to pursue "social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom". Our choice is to allow Haiti to build a future more free, more secure and more prosperous than its past.

The resolution we have adopted today authorizes a two-phased approach. In the first phase, a multinational force, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter, is empowered to restore legitimate authority to Haiti. The United States is prepared to organize and lead such a force. We seek, and anticipate, that others will join. We will begin to professionalize the police and the military. We will establish a stable and secure environment within which democratic officials and institutions can operate. We hope that the current military leaders in Haiti will depart voluntarily and that the multinational force will not be opposed. But this resolution authorizes action whether or not our hopes are realized.

In the second phase, the United Nations Mission in Haiti will assume the full range of its functions. It will continue professionalizing the Haitian armed forces and help build a new civilian police. It will assume responsibility for assisting the Government in assuring public order. It will assist in establishing an environment conducive to free and fair elections. And it will strive to complete its assigned tasks no later than February 1996.

The timing of the transition from phase one to phase two will be determined by the Security Council after appropriate consultation and after a stable and secure environment has been established and the means for fulfilling the United Nations mission are at hand. The United States is prepared to participate in the United Nations mission, and we are encouraged by the willingness of others to participate as well.

The resolution before us meshes well with our policy, and that of the Council, of subjecting proposed new peace operations to rigorous review. Phase one builds on the precedents of Kuwait and Rwanda. Phase two establishes a United Nations mission of modest size, with a clear and achievable mandate, operating in a relatively secure environment, with the consent of the Government, for a finite period of time.

The development of this resolution reflects an interest and concern for events in Haiti that extends throughout the hemisphere and beyond. The Friends of Haiti - Canada, France, Venezuela, Argentina and the United States - have worked closely with the Secretary-General and his Special Representative. All members of the Council have contributed. All may be characterized, in this sense, as friends of Haiti. Together, we have devised a resolution which does honour to this great institution and which is fully consistent with the views expressed by the Organization of American States. My Government urges all Governments to contribute appropriately to the prompt and successful implementation of this resolution.

Let us now go forward with one voice and with shared resolve. The need is great; the cause is just; the ability to make a difference is real; the moment of decision is at hand.

Mr. Ladsous (France) *(interpretation from French):* Once again today the Security Council is meeting on the question of Haiti. It has just adopted an important resolution that authorizes, in a first phase, the establishment of a multinational force mandated to facilitate the departure from Haiti of the rebel military authorities as provided for in the Governors Island Agreement, whose full implementation we have constantly demanded. The resolution further authorizes, in a second phase, the deployment of a peace-keeping force mandated to ensure a stable, secure environment to enable Haiti to return to the path of progress and democracy.

My delegation took no pleasure in voting in favour of the resolution. It is surely regrettable that the international community has been obliged once again to adopt enforcement measures against Haiti. Indeed, everything was done to avoid this final resolution. Since this matter was first brought before it on 16 June 1993, the Security Council has adopted nine resolutions and 10 or so presidential statements. Each and every one of them was a signal sent to the military leaders to accept the accords to which they freely consented on Governors Island and then violated.

The authors of the coup and those who support them must bear full responsibility for the escalation of the situation. They will soon answer for it. Indeed, it is

their fault that the situation in Haiti has become intolerable. More than 50 per cent of the active population of the island is now unemployed. The economy is on the edge of the abyss. Businesses have ceased operations. The health situation is deteriorating with every day that passes. Despite all this, despite the misfortunes of the majority, a minority of unscrupulous profiteers is reaping all possible benefits from the situation.

What is taking place in Haiti has become a source of shame. Haiti was the first country in all Latin and Central America to become independent. Today it is a dictatorship, a country where human rights are massively violated on a daily basis. The expulsion of the United Nations International Civilian Mission in Haiti (MICIVIH) has only aggravated the situation, as is borne out by the reports we continue to receive, and by the departure from the island of tens of thousands of refugees.

There is a time when one has to say that enough is enough. The international community has been patient. It believed in the virtue of dialogue and the force of reason. In that, it was deceived. The Security Council has just drawn the conclusions from this. Recourse to Chapter VII of the Charter as the basis for multinational military action is no insignificant decision. Quite the contrary: it demonstrates a determination to complete successfully, by all necessary means, the task the Council has set itself. The illegitimate authorities in Port-au-Prince should have no illusions. They would be well advised to draw their conclusions from this new situation immediately.

The intentions of the Security Council have not changed since 3 July 1993. We desire the complete implementation of the Governors Island Agreement. That Agreement provides for the return of the lawfully elected President, Jean-Bertrand Aristide. It provides for a radical reform of the military structure which, in Haiti, is a constant source of instability and uncertainty for the future of the country. And finally, it provides for the resumption of economic assistance to Haiti.

France desires a rapid return to democracy and the restoration of President Aristide so that, in a climate of clemency, Haitians will be able to rebuild their country and work for a reconciliation in the cause of a better future. That future also requires the consolidation of institutions and the holding of new elections that will make it possible to restore democracy. France has spared no efforts to facilitate that restoration, and will continue to work along those lines.

Mr. Cardenas (Argentina) *(interpretation from Spanish):* Once again the crisis affecting the people of Haiti has come before the Security Council.

The long-drawn-out tragedy of Haiti was deepened when the Haitian military interrupted the process of the democratization of their country that began with the election on 16 December 1990 of President Jean-Bertrand Aristide, at that time with the unambiguous support of 67 per cent of the total vote. That election, as we recall, was monitored by the United Nations, the Organization of American States (OAS) and the Caribbean community.

The election of President Aristide allowed the Haitian people to dream of the possibility of freeing itself from its tragic past, which included the two dictatorships of François and Jean Claude Duvalier, together with five years of political instability during which five different regimes succeeded each other in power in a kind of danse macabre that was known, sadly, as the "Dance of the Generals".

On 30 September 1991 the coup d'état that was headed by Raoul Cédras throttled the hopes for the new-born democracy of the people, and since that time the people of Haiti have been suffering in a progressive, accelerated and undisguised deterioration of the situation with regard to the protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms to the extent that, as is indicated in this year's report on human development by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), in 1992 alone some 1,800 Haitians lost their lives to political intolerance or simply because of the brutality of the military regime.

Since then, as is all too well known, the situation has grown progressively worse, as though this were inevitable. Hence the understandable despair of so many who have sought by any means to overcome their plight and escape the daily tragedy that has gripped their country.

Once the democratic process was interrupted, the OAS did not hesitate to react. At the regional level at that time it spoke out in favour of the return of President Aristide, recommending that its members suspend economic, financial and commercial ties with Haiti.

Shortly thereafter, the General Assembly of this Organization condemned the attempt to replace illegally President Aristide and the use of violence and violations

of human rights in Haiti, declaring unacceptable any entity that might result from that illegal situation and demanding the immediate return of the lawful Government of President Aristide.

The United Nations and the OAS embarked upon a series of lengthy negotiations that included the visit to Haiti in October 1991 of the Foreign Ministers of Argentina, Bolivia, Canada, Costa Rica, Jamaica, Trinidad and Tobago, Venezuela and the United States with the goal of trying to persuade those who had usurped power to desist from their attitude. Those negotiations were interrupted time and again by the action of the military clique of the Haitian forces, who sought to provoke the forced departure from the country of those ministers, abruptly interrupting their goodwill mission.

At the end of 1992, the General Assembly, as we recall, again condemned the coup and demanded the return of President Aristide.

In mid-1993 the Security Council, responding to the request of the Permanent Representative of President Aristide to the United Nations and in line with the sanctions imposed by the OAS earlier, decided to impose sanctions on Haiti in the form of an embargo on oil and arms.

In the face of the growing international pressure, the head of the de facto authorities in Haiti signed with President Aristide the Governors Island Agreement under the auspices of both the regional organization and of the United Nations. The verification of the commitments assumed in the Agreement was to be effected by the OAS and the United Nations.

The persistent failure of the de facto illegal regime of Haiti to comply with the obligations it assumed under the Governors Island Agreement and the New York Pact of July 1993 and the regime's constant attitude of provocation towards the international community have brought about the failure of each and every one of the efforts to find a peaceful solution to the crisis in Haiti.

The signing of these promising accords, which generated hopes for a possible peaceful transition to the restoration of democracy, prompted the Security Council, by its resolution 861 (1993) of 27 August 1993, to suspend the measures imposed by resolution 841 (1993).

Unfortunately, very shortly thereafter, the Security Council was obliged to deplore the increase in acts of violence in Haiti, particularly the events that occurred on 11 and 12 September 1993, when no fewer than a dozen people were murdered, including a prominent supporter of President Aristide, who was attending a religious service.

Despite these serious events, the Security Council did not immediately revoke the suspension of the sanctions but preferred to give the illegal regime one more opportunity to cease violating the commitments it had undertaken. The presidential statement of 17 September 1993 warned that sanctions would immediately be reimposed if the Secretary-General reported, in accordance with resolution 861 (1993), that the grave non-compliance with the Governors Island Agreement was persisting.

On 11 October 1993, the serious incidents at Port-au-Prince that prevented the deployment of part of the military component of the United Nations Mission in Haiti (UNMIH) were reported. At the request of the Security Council, made in the presidential statement of 11 October 1993, the Secretary-General submitted an emergency report on 13 October 1993 which painted a shattering picture of the situation in Haiti.

According to that report, the incidents at Port-au-Prince were not isolated. On the contrary, they represented the culmination of the deteriorating situation in Haiti, manifested in a number of actions and omissions by the de facto illegal regime: the lack of will, shown on countless occasions, of the command of the Haitian armed forces to facilitate the deployment and work of UNMIH; the administrative impediments that delayed the launching of the Mission's work; the inaction in dealing with armed civilians who imposed their law - the law of terror - on the ground and sowed that terror throughout Haiti.

The various examples mentioned in the report reflected the lack of a sincere desire on the part of the Haitian military leaders to cooperate in bringing about a peaceful transition to a democratic society, in accordance with the provisions of the Governors Island Agreement. What is more, these events constituted proof of a clear and explicit determination to prevent the success of the democratic process laid down in that Agreement.

The Secretary-General concluded that there was a serious and persistent lack of implementation of the Governors Island Agreement, and considered, in the light of the opinions expressed also by the Secretary-General

of the Organization of American States (OAS), that it was necessary to revoke the suspension of the measures set forth in resolution 841 (1993).

Accordingly, the Council, in resolution 873 (1993), of 13 October 1993, decided to reimpose the sanctions set forth in resolution 841 (1993) as of 18 October 1993, unless the parties complied with their commitments. On 16 October 1993, in resolution 875 (1993), the Council called upon Member States to adopt the measures necessary to ensure strict implementation of the provisions of resolutions 841 (1993) and 873 (1993).

On 30 October 1993, the Security Council, in a presidential statement, continued to insist on full and unconditional compliance with the Governors Island Agreement, recalling that the Agreement remained fully in force and that it was the only valid framework for the solution of the crisis in Haiti. Once again the Council condemned the fact that General Cedras and the military authorities had not fulfilled their obligations under the Agreement. In another warning to the illegal de facto regime, the Security Council reaffirmed its determination to maintain sanctions and even to strengthen them if the military regime continued to interrupt the democratic transition.

However, the situation deteriorated even more from January 1994. The stagnation of the political negotiations was compounded by the exacerbation of the violence in Port-au-Prince and by serious violations of human rights.

Between the end of January and the beginning of April 1994, the International Civilian Mission in Haiti (MICIVIH) published 11 press releases on the deterioration of the human rights situation, and specifically the increase in the number of extrajudicial executions, suspicious deaths and arbitrary detentions, the many cases of rape, the wave of repression in the provinces, and the abductions and clandestine detention centers in Port-au-Prince and the surrounding areas.

In successive reports to the Security Council, of 19 January 1994 and 18 March 1994, the Secretary-General confirmed the absence of any fundamental change in the situation in Haiti.

In his 29 April 1993 report to the General Assembly on the situation of democracy and human rights in Haiti, the Secretary-General had already concluded that the situation was complicated and that there was little prospect of resolving it. Without any change for the better, it was not easy to define what sort of activity could be undertaken by the United Nations to resolve the grave crisis in Haiti. However, he stressed that it was important to maintain the presence of MICIVIH, which, though it could not remedy the situation, could, through its mere presence, shed light on certain events and denounce abuses that otherwise would remain unknown.

After considering the recent evolution of events in Haiti, the Security Council, in resolution 917 (1994), of 6 May 1994, decided among other things to impose new measures to strengthen the sanctions against the illegal authorities in that country.

However, in the first report submitted to the Security Council on 20 June 1994, in compliance with that resolution, the Secretary-General once again deplored the fact that since the adoption of that resolution no progress had been made in the implementation of the Governors Island Agreement. On the contrary, he indicated that the rise to power of the illegitimate government of Mr. Emile Jonassaint, the growing impact of the economic sanctions, the continued repression and the humanitarian crisis had all served to increase the tensions in the country. The human rights situation had deteriorated sharply, with new patterns of repression being reported, including the abduction and rape of family members of political activists. Since the adoption of resolution 917 (1994) - and this cannot be ignored - MICIVIH had already documented 50 politically related assassinations. Moreover, the Secretary-General reported that the security situation remained highly unstable and that incidents had occurred in which embassy staff members and United Nations security officers had been subjected to threats and intimidation from armed civilians and military personnel.

In the context of this continually deteriorating situation, marked by increasing violence against the civilian population, at the beginning of July 1994 the illegal de facto regime decided to expel from the country the joint International Civilian Mission (MICIVIH) of the United Nations and the OAS. This attempt to avoid the continuation of an independent and appropriate international inspection was vigorously condemned by the Security Council in the presidential statement of 12 July 1994, which described this decision as a provocation, emphasizing that it represented a serious escalation in the defiant stance of the illegal de facto regime of Haiti towards the international community.

Reaffirming the objective of the international community to restore democracy in Haiti, the Security Council, in May of this year, applied - and exhausted - all those measures provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter which do not imply the use of force, in order to bring pressure to bear on the Haitian military regime.

Since the beginning of the crisis in Haiti, the so-called Rio Group has also expressed its full support for President Aristide and has called upon the de facto authorities to comply with the commitments they assumed - but once more they did this without any success whatsoever.

The ad hoc meeting of the Foreign Ministers of the OAS in June of this year condemned, among other things, the persistence of delaying tactics and intimidation by the de facto military authorities against the international community and the Haitian people who seek the restoration of democracy.

We would like to draw attention and pay tribute in particular to the efforts and courage of the Special Envoy of the Secretaries-General of the United Nations and of the OAS, Mr. Dante Caputo, who at all times has committed all of his energies to the achievement of democratic objectives.

The whole extensive and frustrating activity I have just described clearly demonstrates the long path - required by the effort to negotiate - that has been travelled for no less than almost three years now.

The mechanisms provided for by the Charter of the United Nations were, it is clear, applied gradually and patiently - first the measures provided for in Chapter VI of the Charter and then those contained in Chapter VII which do not imply the use of force. One thing is certain: that neither the calls of the General Assembly in connection with human rights and the restoration of democracy, nor the enforcement measures provided for by the Security Council, nor the time that has elapsed, nor the various efforts to negotiate that have been made have had any impact on the usurpers of power in Haiti.

It is obvious that, during these three years, every alternative available has been exhausted one by one. At the same time, the Haitian people - the true and authentic depositary of its country's sovereignty - has waited as its humanitarian situation has seriously deteriorated. This is precisely what has happened, and the truth not only has to be recognized but is also air that has to be breathed. That is why we are particularly resentful.

There is only one entity responsible here - the illegal de facto regime that has usurped power in Haiti. Its behaviour has been characterized by constant ill faith and defiance of the international community. Its inexplicable arrogance is typical of those who time and again have toppled democratic regimes in the region. In the interests of peace, for clear humanitarian reasons, and in order permanently to restore democracy to Haiti, all necessary means must be made available to ensure that the commitments undertaken by the signatories of the Governors Island Agreement are fulfilled without further delay, disruption or deception.

After all the effort that has been made, the maintenance of international peace and security, the strengthening and consolidation of democracy and the full enjoyment of human rights in the region now require resolute action to liberate the Haitian people from the oppression of the de facto Government. This is specifically suggested in the options for the establishment of an expanded force, contained in the recent report of the Secretary-General (S/1994/828). Though we might have preferred a traditional peace-keeping operation, the options fall within the framework of the Charter and address this difficult situation. They are in keeping with what the President of Haiti requested in his recent letter to the Secretary-General and was specifically confirmed by his Permanent Representative to the Organization. That is of decisive, truly key importance.

The Argentine Republic has been clearly committed to the effort to restore democracy to Haiti, not only through regional and multilateral action but also because of the personal dedication of its Foreign Minister. Furthermore, in accordance with the international obligations assumed by our country, we recall that, for almost a year now, we have had an armed naval unit off the coast of Haiti to monitor and control compliance with the sanctions imposed by this Security Council. Moreover, our country has made a contingent of gendarmes available for cooperation with the authorities of the Dominican Republic and other Member States in monitoring that country's land border with Haiti. Our readiness has been expressed in concrete action and continues today.

Indeed, my delegation co-sponsored the resolution adopted by the Council today and, consistent with the provisions of the Constitution of the Argentine nation, will support the stipulated action, which is in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and in response to

the explicit requests of the democratic Government of Haiti.

This Security Council is well aware that the solution to the crisis in Haiti lies in the restoration of the democratic regime. This requires respect and support for the sovereignty of the Haitian people, which was seized and usurped by those who unlawfully hold power in that country today. Moreover, an end must be put to a humanitarian crisis so vast, and atrocities so unspeakable, that this Council has determined that they can no longer be hidden behind a border.

That is how we understand the meaning of the resolution which - with the aim of preserving international peace and security and restoring dignity to the Haitian people - we have adopted today after following the course I have described for almost three years, and which makes it clear that this is a unique and exceptional situation that can no longer be put off.

Beyond rhetoric, it is also a question of restoring to the people of Haiti - within the framework of the Charter and with the unequivocal support of the constitutional Government - the sovereignty of which it has been too long cruelly stripped. It will then be necessary generously to help this people to begin rebuilding its truly devastated country. I hope it will be understood that this is a commitment that must be undertaken by all.

Mr. Gomersall (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland): The Government of the United Kingdom recognizes the intense efforts which the Secretary-General and the Special Representative of the Secretaries-General of the United Nations and the Organization of American States (OAS) have made to bring about a peaceful and lasting solution to the crisis in Haiti. It is not through lack of resolve on their part that the situation in Haiti has deteriorated to the extent that the Security Council has taken the decisions set out in the resolution we have just adopted.

The adoption of this resolution by the Council is an unequivocal signal that the international community is fast losing patience in the face of the intransigent attitude of the illegal regime.

A year has passed since the signing of the Governors Island Agreement and the New York Pact, which set out a workable basis for a peaceful solution. Despite clear warnings from this Council, from the Organization of American States and from the international community as a whole, the illegal regime has consistently refused to abide by commitments made in those agreements. It has also defied a series of resolutions passed by this Council demanding the restoration of democracy and the return of the legitimately elected authorities to Haiti. Increasingly stringent measures have been adopted by this Council, but it is clear that they are not working.

The intransigence of the illegal regime has caused increasing misery to the people of Haiti and led to an exodus which threatens the stability of the region, including dependent territories of the United Kingdom. Successive reports by independent and objective observers in the country have clearly demonstrated how the illegal regime has been responsible for serious abuses of human rights, including torture, rape, imprisonment without trial and extrajudicial executions. The regime's response has been cowardly and vindictive. My Government condemns the recent decision by the regime to expel the international Civilian Mission whose remit was to monitor the humanitarian situation. The decision was a desperate attempt to avoid international censure, but it has not worked. The international community is now all the more determined to bring an end to the suffering caused to the people of Haiti by the corrupt dictatorship which has ruined their lives.

It is my Government's wish that the legitimate authorities be restored and that due action be taken to build a stable, solid, accountable and uncorrupt society in Haiti. The present resolution authorizes a multinational force to use all necessary means to facilitate the immediate departure from Haiti of the military leadership, as called for in the Governors Island Agreement. It expands the mandate of the United Nations Mission in Haiti and authorizes its deployment once the multinational force has established security and stability in the country. This, and the economic and other support mentioned by previous speakers, will be essential to complete the task.

Today's measure, is in our view a necessary step in the circumstances to break the situation of illegality in Haiti. We hope that the regime will now heed the warning that has been given. It is still not too late for those in power to face up to their obligations and leave. But they should not doubt the determination of the international community - which my Government strongly supports - to resolve this unacceptable situation.

Mr. Yañez-Barnuevo (Spain) *(interpretation from Spanish)*: At the outset, my delegation wishes to thank the Secretary-General for submitting his reports of 15 and 26 July and for the efforts he and the Special Representative of the Secretaries-General of the United Nations and the Organization of American States (OAS), Mr. Dante Caputo, have been making to resolve the crisis in Haiti.

We also wish to pay a tribute to the selfless actions of the personnel of the United Nations and the Organization of American States (OAS) who, as members of the International Civilian Mission in Haiti (MICIVIH), carried out crucially important work in the observation of the human rights situation in Haiti, until, in an arbitrary action that was quite rightly condemned by the Council, they were forced to leave the country by the de facto authorities.

Finally, we wish to express our gratitude and support to the personnel of the United Nations system dedicated to the delivery of humanitarian assistance in Haiti, who face a very difficult situation on the ground every day.

The reports of the Secretary-General have been extremely enlightening, and they have helped the Council to form a precise idea of our choices for a more decisive action on the part of the international community in order to resolve the crisis in Haiti.

As the Secretary-General points out in his report of 15 July,

> "The senior leadership of the Armed Forces of Haiti continue to defy the will of the international community and to inflict murder, rape and torture on the ... people of Haiti ...". *(S/1994/828, para. 24)*

A few weeks ago the defiance of the international community by the authorities who unlawfully hold de facto power in Port-au-Prince reached new heights when, in an attempt to rid themselves of some bothersome witnesses to their practices, which violate the most elementary principles of civilized society, they expelled the personnel of the International Civilian Mission.

At the same time, we are all aware that the sanctions regime, though the great majority of States are complying with it, has had too many leaks and, in any case, has seemed not to be enough to persuade the de facto authorities to alter their attitude. It has also contributed to the prolongation of the suffering of the Haitian people, which was not the intention of the international community.

In these circumstances it became necessary for the Council to consider the best way to achieve, with the desired speed and effectiveness, the objectives set by the international community. Those objectives, within the framework of the Governors Island Agreement and the New York Pact, signed more than a year ago and yet to be fully implemented, are none other than the restoration of democracy in Haiti and the return of its legitimate President, Mr. Jean-Bertrand Aristide.

In the pursuit of those objectives, the international community has proved its willingness to exhaust all possibilities for a peaceful settlement of the crisis, as was pointed out by the representative of Argentina, among others. No member of this Council wanted, or wants, to give up on that possibility until it is shown to be out of reach. Hence, the decision we have taken today in adopting resolution 940 (1994) is a difficult one that has been made unavoidable by the obstinacy with which the de facto authorities of Haiti have failed to comply with the resolutions of the Security Council and to fulfil the commitments they undertook, with the United Nations as witness and guarantor, in the Governors Island Agreement.

It should be recalled at this point that in resolution 873 (1993) of October 1993 the Security Council declared its willingness to consider the imposition of additional measures if the de facto authorities kept to their course of provocation and defiance. Their attitude since that time cannot be described in any other terms.

Through the resolution we have just adopted, the Council authorizes Member States to establish a temporary multinational force in order to use all necessary means to facilitate the immediate departure of the leaders of the Haitian military and police, the return of the legitimate authorities of Haiti and the establishment of secure and stable conditions that will make possible the full implementation of the Governors Island Agreement.

It must be stressed that this decision is an exceptional one, taken in response to the singular circumstances attending the Haitian crisis. To all the facts I have already mentioned, I must add the position taken by the legitimate authorities of Haiti, as expressed in the letter addressed to the Secretary-General from the Constitutional President, Mr. Aristide, in which he invites the international community to take

"prompt and decisive action, under the authority of the United Nations" *(S/1994/905, annex)*

to allow for the full implementation of the Governors Island Agreement. We should also bear in mind the letter (S/1994/910) from the Permanent Representative of Haiti which communicates President Aristide's agreement with the draft resolution sponsored by Argentina, Canada, France and the United States.

Spain, which attaches great importance to the principle of non-intervention, especially on the American continent, supported resolution 940 (1994) because of the singular and exceptional circumstances of this case, because of the clear position taken by the legitimate authorities of Haiti and because the action to be initiated will not be carried out unilaterally but, rather, within a multilateral and institutional framework, under the authority and control of the United Nations. Had it been otherwise, we should not have been able to support such an action.

It must be stressed that in the view of both the Secretary-General, as expressed in his report of 15 July, and the Council, as expressed in the terms of the resolution we have just adopted, the work carried out by the multinational force and, subsequently, by the United Nations Mission in Haiti (UNMIH) in the second phase of the operation will be aimed at assisting the legitimate authorities of Haiti in carrying out their constitutional functions.

Spain wishes to convey in advance its appreciation to the States that propose to contribute towards the objectives of the multinational force and later to the reconstituted, reinforced UNMIH in a complex operation designed to render a service to the Haitian people and to the international community as a whole.

We are aware of the risks and dangers entailed in an operation of this type. For that reason, we understand very well the warnings and reservations expressed by a number of delegations, particularly Latin American ones, in today's meeting. For that reason too we understand the Council's being so very cautious, though, for our part, we would have preferred it to be more emphatic in its creation of the multinational force's mandate, its terms of operation and the transition to the second phase of the operation, in which UNMIH can fully assume its functions. And we also understand that in the implementation of the resolution we shall have to be at least as scrupulous as we have been in its drafting.

The resolution we have just adopted establishes an advance group of UNMIH of 60 personnel to establish the appropriate means of coordination with the multinational force. This advance team is to include a group of military observers who will monitor the operations of the multinational force. The Secretary-General will report to the Council on the activities of the advance team within 30 days of the deployment of the multinational force.

In addition, the Member States participating in the multinational force will, for their part, keep the Council informed at regular, frequent intervals. Similarly, the Secretary-General himself will report periodically to the Council on the implementation of the resolution.

The Council's follow-up mechanism does not end there. In accordance with resolution 917 (1994) of May 1994 and until President Aristide returns, the Secretary-General will continue to report every month on all aspects of the situation in Haiti so that the Council can keep this matter under constant consideration.

We might close our eyes and imagine a world in which problems could be solved as quickly as they appear, a world where we could guarantee that an operation of this kind would put an end to the poverty and oppression of the people of Haiti. Unfortunately, everyone realizes that the success of the international community in its immediate objective to restore democracy in Haiti will mark not an end but barely a point of departure.

Humanitarian assistance, and in particular assistance to development, constitutes the cornerstone of stability and long-term social peace in Haiti. The international community, like it or not, has a standing commitment to the economic and social development of Haiti. The only effective vaccination against a succession of ruling cliques, with their greater or lesser ability to bring about terror and intimidation, as has frequently been the case in Haiti's history, will be to create the necessary antibodies through sustained action in favour of democracy and development.

It has been said that the difference between a coward and a brave person lies in the circumstances that make them flee. The de facto authorities in Haiti have shown that they can flee in many directions, including headlong - but all of these flights have been up to now dictated by cowardice. Although it may be too much to hope for, if the military leaders in Haiti were to show

some kind of courage and dignity or just common sense, this time they should surrender to the will of the international community and end the scourge they are imposing on their own people, before the hand of justice descends on them.

Mr. Keating (New Zealand): It is now a year since the Haitian military regime led by General Cédras signed the Governors Island Agreement and agreed to step aside and allow the return of President Aristide. New Zealand welcomed that decision and has consistently supported the United Nations-sponsored peace process to restore democratic Government in Haiti.

Some months later, and two years after his initial usurpation of power, General Cédras repudiated that Agreement, and he rejected the firmly expressed position of the international community. Since then, he has continued to demonstrate a complete disregard for the rule of law in Haiti and for the commitments that he himself entered into at Governors Island.

When the rule of law is violated, as it has been in Haiti and, regrettably, by very many regimes over very many decades, it is the people who suffer. It is no coincidence that a series of irresponsible, unaccountable regimes has left the people of Haiti the most miserable in the Western hemisphere - so much so that we remember that, when President Aristide was elected, his promise was merely to lift his people from misery to poverty. It is also no coincidence that under the latest usurping regime, the rights of the people of Haiti have been further abused and trammelled, and that many Haitians see flight in perilous circumstances as preferable to life in their own country.

The restoration of democracy in Haiti goes hand in hand with guarantees of the rights of all the people of Haiti, not just those with power and wealth and access to the external world. On that foundation, the people of Haiti can establish a civil society in which the military will perform the tasks assigned to them in Haiti's constitution and no longer threaten the people they are meant to protect.

I think it is important to underline that the international community has not been precipitate in this matter. Sanctions were the first step, and these were reimposed as long ago as last October, after General Cédras repudiated the Governors Island Agreement. Sanctions were strengthened some months later in a further effort to persuade the leaders of Haiti to comply with the agreements that they had entered into.

We accept that time has been given for sanctions to work, and the answer is clear: they are not going to produce a quick departure by the illegal military regime. And we are very conscious that in the meantime, the economic impact is being felt most acutely by the truly innocent: the long-suffering people of Haiti.

The willingness of the United Nations to contemplate more stringent forms of action has been clearly on the table for some time, set out in warnings in Security Council resolutions. The resolution we have adopted today takes the next step.

It is a matter of real regret to us that things have come to this point, but it is clear from events of recent weeks that there is no evidence at all of any willingness by the military leadership to step back from the course of action on which they seem determined. On the contrary, the installation of a puppet president is just the most flagrant example of the continuing violation of constitutional order. The expulsion of members of the United Nations Civilian Mission demonstrated further that scrutiny by the international community of the situation in Haiti is not being tolerated. It is therefore necessary to increase the pressure on the military regime. Approval now by the Security Council of an intervention force should persuade that regime that the only sensible course of action now left is for it to comply with the Governors Island Agreement voluntarily.

This resolution is also about peaceful settlement of problems. It gives them one last chance, and we urge the military leadership in Haiti to honour the commitments that they made last year and to allow this issue to be resolved peacefully.

For all these reasons, New Zealand supports the formal request by the legitimate Government of Haiti for decisive action to be taken by the United Nations at this time to enable the legitimate Government of Haiti to be restored and constitutional order in that country to be re-established.

In supporting this resolution, however, New Zealand has had a number of broad concerns about the manner in which the Council has had to come to deal with this and other recent situations. Firstly, I need to record that New Zealand's preference has always been and will always be for collective security to be undertaken by the United Nations itself. That provides the reassurance that small countries seek from the United Nations when Chapter VII is being invoked. This is not to say that we

have reservations about the use of Chapter VII, either in this case or other specific cases where it is appropriate.

However, we believe very strongly that unless absolutely exceptional circumstances exist the United Nations itself should assume such responsibilities. In this regard, we have to record also that we do not agree with the Secretary-General's conclusion that this was not feasible in the case of Haiti. The resource and management difficulties that the United Nations faces are undeniable, but we believe they should be seen as challenges to be overcome, not as excuses for throwing in the towel and abrogating the responsibilities for international-dispute settlement under United Nations auspices which New Zealand and other Governments expect this Organization to fulfil.

Secondly, I have to record our concern about the resources being devoted to this operation. As I have said, we are ready and prepared to support the devotion of United Nations resources to the restoration of democracy in Haiti. But we believe that the commitment of international resources to Haiti necessarily raises questions about claims elsewhere in the world on equivalent resources. In supporting a multinational intervention and a United Nations force for Haiti, we have the hope and the expectation that when the call next goes out for international assistance to restore democracy or to protect people in a humanitarian disaster in some other small and distant country, the United Nations and all the members of the Council will not be found wanting. The United Nations must be able, as in the case of Haiti, to count on political will and support when it is needed elsewhere.

In conclusion, I want to refer to the question that was raised in the debate today by the representative of Mexico. He argued that the Security Council was writing a blank cheque with this resolution. I would like to say that while this may perhaps have been an understandable criticism of earlier versions of the draft resolution, the resolution adopted today contains some elements - which I am pleased to say were introduced in part as a result of proposals from my delegation - which clearly indicate that the operation would be of a temporary nature and would be focused specifically on a specific point in history. We do not believe, therefore, that it is an open-ended "blank cheque", and we believe that the resolution reflects this.

Mr. Olhaye (Djibouti): Today we adopted a resolution on the situation in Haiti, based upon two recent reports of the Secretary-General updating us on the ever-worsening events there and presenting the Council with clear and unmistakable options for its consideration as it strove to reach a workable decision. This is not a simple resolution at all, its complexity undoubtedly mirroring both the reality on the ground and the emerging policy consensus with respect to Haiti. We are very grateful, however, to the sponsors of the resolution for their efforts and their skill, and for the patience and understanding they have demonstrated throughout the negotiation of the terms of the resolution.

There is really nothing that needs to be said about the military authorities in Haiti. The violence against their own people has become so prevalent, widespread and obvious that even the awesome spectacle of so many Haitians fleeing their own country on the dangerous open seas can scarcely reflect the extent and magnitude of the brutality of those authorities. Such has been the mounting impact on so many countries in the region that the crisis is clearly a threat to regional peace and security.

By its many attempts to thwart the will of the international community, to say nothing of that of its own people, the military junta has clearly demonstrated that it has no desire to leave. Its defiance of the United Nations embargo and sanctions, its expulsion of the monitors from the Organization of American States and the United Nations and its having reneged on the Governors Island Agreement are all vivid testimony to its none-too-hidden agenda. In all events it is not prepared in any manner for a return of the legitimate Government, which the international community is just as determined will return. The course set is that of collision.

As the Secretary-General explained in his report of 15 July (S/1994/828), Chapter-VII intervention by the United Nations is not possible owing to the lack of resources and to the contemplated time period that would be necessary to assemble a force - if this could be done at all. Following the Secretary-General's lead, the resolution expands on the third option he proposes and authorizes a multinational force under Chapter VII to use all necessary means to facilitate the departure of the leadership of the Haitian police and military. The aim is simple: the return of the legitimate Government of Haiti - that of President Aristide - and the implementation of the Governors Island Agreement.

Initiated following a request from the legitimate Government of Haiti, the resolution calls for a multinational force with a clearly defined goal: that of creating and maintaining a secure and stable environment so as to bring about the implementation of the Governors Island Agreement. It is to be succeeded by an expanded force of the United Nations Mission in Haiti (UNMIH) once peace has been restored.

This resolution and the action it contemplates, however, raise a number of issues that it would be wise for the Council to reflect upon. After a period of ascendancy following the end of the cold war, democracies are coming under increasing pressure from many quarters. As in Haiti, we must not waver in our determination to assist them whenever possible and wherever practicable.

We must also reflect upon the growing pattern of reliance upon ad hoc multinational intervention forces to mitigate or resolve conflicts or conflict-induced humanitarian crises. Should the United Nations continue to encounter difficulties in assembling the manpower and resources necessary to address such situations, as we have seen in Haiti and other places, we could face the prospect of diminishing credibility. The United Nations must retain its determination, its creativity, its capability and, of course, its means, or the future could become increasingly unpredictable - which means unsafe.

My delegation found it possible despite certain lingering doubts and apprehensions to support the resolution, for some action is no doubt critically necessary. The illegal de facto regime has adopted a policy of worsening the situation in a highly visible way, and it continues to weaken, and wreak havoc upon, world resolve and determination. It expects then to fashion a solution to its own taste.

But even its departure will not end the story, as the Secretary-General alerts us, for, with the economy and the infrastructure destroyed, large amounts of humanitarian assistance and international involvement will be needed in the long term, the cost of which mounts with each additional day of military rule. That is precisely what this resolution attempts to thwart.

Mr. Vorontsov (Russian Federation) *(interpretation from Russian):* Like other members of the Security Council, the Russian Federation is gravely concerned at the constantly deteriorating situation in Haiti. The reports of the Secretary-General of 15 and 26 July 1994, documents S/1994/828 and S/1994/871 respectively, clearly show that the dangerous course of events in Haiti is a direct consequence of the actions of the illegal military regime that continues to trample underfoot the rights of the Haitian people, inflict violence and terror, and prevent the restoration of the legitimate civilian Government and the return of the President duly elected by the Haitian people: Mr. Jean-Bertrand Aristide. These actions constitute a direct violation of the demands of the Security Council for the implementation in its entirety of the Governors Island Agreement. The Haitian military junta threw down the gauntlet to the international community when it announced recently the expulsion of the joint United Nations/Organization of American States (OAS) International Civilian Mission (MICIVIH), whose mandate had been extended by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 8 July 1994. The junta is in this way attempting to conceal from view its flagrant violations of human rights. Clearly, the Security Council cannot continue to countenance a situation which was quite rightly described by the Secretary-General as intolerable.

In these circumstances, the resolution we have just adopted was a difficult but necessary step that bore witness to the determination of the Security Council to put an end to the protracted crisis in Haiti and to ensure the implementation of the decisions adopted earlier by the Council.

In voting for this Security Council resolution, the Russian Federation took into account the fact that it enjoyed the support of President Jean-Bertrand Aristide.

The Russian Federation attaches great importance to the total transparency of the operation authorized by the Security Council for a multinational force in Haiti. Such transparency is essential to ensure complete confidence in the actions of the multinational force by the international community and support by the international community for that operation.

In that connection, we would note that the resolution adopted provides for close coordination between the multinational force and the advance team of the United Nations Mission in Haiti (UNMIH), for monitoring by United Nations observers of the operations of the multinational force and for verifying, as provided for in the Secretary-General's report of 15 July 1994,

> "the manner in which that force carried out the mandate conferred upon it by the Council" *(S/1994/828, para. 23)*

Of great importance in this connection is the request contained in the resolution to the Secretary-General to report to the Security Council on the activities of the advance team of the United Nations Mission in Haiti.

The Russian Federation supports the concept in the resolution of a two-phase operation.

The delegation of the Russian Federation would like to emphasize in this connection that the Security Council will have to return to the question of the mandate, the size of the United Nations Mission in Haiti and other issues of deployment and activities of the mission in phase two of the operation which have financial implications when it adopts the corresponding decisions on the transition from phase one to phase two of the operation.

In conclusion, I should like to say that the Russian Federation hopes that the Council's adoption of this resolution today will be of substantial help in implementing the Governors Island Agreement and the complete settlement of the crisis in Haiti.

Mr. Rovensky (Czech Republic): My Government is alarmed and deeply concerned by the continuing negative developments in Haiti. Since the day the military junta seized power there it has been nothing but a destructive force.

It has destroyed the first fragile seedlings of democracy in Haiti.

It has forced the democratically elected President to leave Haiti and it has prevented him from returning to the island and assuming his office.

It has with increasing brutality violated civil liberties and basic human rights and has systematically murdered its political opponents.

It has time and time again shown unwillingness to honour its obligations under the Governors Island Agreement of 3 July 1993 and the relevant Security Council resolutions.

It has shown nothing but total contempt and disregard for the will of the international community.

There is no doubt in our minds that the situation in Haiti constitutes a real and growing threat to peace, security and stability in the region.

We have been patient with the illegal de facto regime in Haiti for a very long time. However, the long and painstaking effort by the international community to restore democracy to Haiti through peaceful, political means and through the imposition of economic sanctions has clearly failed.

Our patience has been misinterpreted by the junta as a sign of weakness. The putchists think that by calling the bluff of the international community they can maintain their deadly stranglehold on Haiti and cling to power, while making life for ordinary Haitians more miserable with each passing day, forcing many of them to seek refuge abroad.

The resolution which the Council has just adopted proves them wrong. It sends a clear, unequivocal and final message to the junta: get out or you will be forced out.

Resolution 940 (1994) is unique. For the first time in its history, the Security Council has authorized Member States to use all necessary means to restore democracy in a United Nations Member State, and to create conditions for a better and more dignified life for its population.

Because of the unique character of this mission, the Security Council members have considered the key parts of the draft resolution with particular attention and care. We are grateful to the Group of Friends of the Secretary-General on Haiti, which has worked closely and intensively with the members of the Council in considering a number of important and far-reaching issues, which are contained in the resolution.

The clarity of the mandate and a clear definition of both phases of the envisaged operation, the role of the United Nations observers in the operation, as well as its time-frame, have been at the forefront of our attention. My delegation believes that all important aspects of the mission should have been addressed in the resolution in a clear and satisfactory manner.

We are pleased that the Security Council's actions have the full support of democratically-elected representatives of Haiti, and we are confident that this support will be extended to the group of States which will form the multinational force.

By adopting today's resolution, the Security Council has not only launched a new and decisive phase in the

effort by the international community to take Haiti out of the hands of the military junta and restore democracy on the island. It has also committed itself to a long-term programme of support for Haiti. We strongly believe that there should be continuous close cooperation and coordination in this respect between the United Nations and the Organization of American States. My delegation trusts that the Council will pursue the goal of long-term support for Haiti with the same determination it has shown when considering and adopting this important resolution.

Mr. Al-Khussaiby (Oman): On 3 July 1993, the Governors Island Agreement was signed under the aegis of the United Nations and the Organization of American States (OAS). It provided, *inter alia*, for the return of the democratically-elected President of Haiti, His Excellency Mr. Jean-Bertrand Aristide, by 30 October 1993.

One year after the signing of that Agreement, the illegal de facto regime and military authorities in Haiti continue to drag their feet on the implementation of its relevant provisions, and to inflict murder, rape and torture on the unfortunate people of Haiti.

Their decision a few weeks ago to expel the human rights monitors at a time of increasing and indiscriminate violence against the civilian population of Haiti was yet another act of defiance of the will of the international community. My delegation believes strongly that this state of affairs is intolerable.

The Secretary-General's report points out that the mandate entrusted to the United Nations Mission in Haiti (UNMIH) by resolution 867 (1993) could not be implemented owing to various developments in that country which constitute non-compliance by the Armed Forces of Haiti with the relevant provisions of the Governors Island Agreement.

The report therefore calls for the modification of the original mandate of UNMIH. It further proposes the expansion of the mandate so as to include additional tasks. My delegation is in agreement with the Secretary-General regarding the proposed tasks mentioned in paragraph 9 of that report. As to the three options put forward by the Secretary-General for the expanded force of UNMIH, my delegation has chosen option three, as modified, because it has the advantage of dividing the work between a multinational force and UNMIH.

We supported the contents of this resolution in the hope that it will send a loud and clear message to the illegal de facto regime and its military leaders in Haiti that the time has come for them to leave. The international community is adamant in its intention to assist the restoration of democracy in Haiti and the prompt return of its democratically elected Government.

In conclusion, my delegation strongly feels that this particular Haitian case must be seen as a unique, special and complex one in its own right, and should not be taken as a precedent for other cases. My delegation believes that with the adoption of this resolution today legal and democratic government will return to Haiti and alleviate the suffering and pain of the Haitian people. We also hope that today's action will strengthen peace, security and stability in the region.

The President: I shall now make a statement in my capacity as the representative of Pakistan.

My delegation thanks the Secretary-General for his two excellent reports on the situation in Haiti contained in documents S/1994/828 and S/1994/871. My delegation is deeply concerned at the significant further deterioration of the situation in Haiti and the continuing disregard of the Governors Island Agreement by the illegal de facto regime of that country. We deplore the regime's refusal to cooperate with the efforts by the United Nations and the Organization of American States (OAS) to bring about the implementation of the Governors Island Agreement. In this context, we strongly condemn the recent expulsion of the staff of the International Civilian Mission (MICIVIH).

We recognize that the present deteriorating situation in Haiti is both unique and exceptional and constitutes a threat to peace and security in the region, requiring an exceptional response by the international community.

In this context, we would also like to recall the 7 June 1994 communiqué of the OAS Ministers, who urged all Member States to support measures by the United Nations to strengthen the United Nations Mission in Haiti (UNMIH) - *inter alia*, to assist in the restoration of democracy. Furthermore, the legitimate President of Haiti, Mr. Jean-Bertrand Aristide, has, in his letter dated 29 July 1994 addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, called for "prompt and decisive" action by the international community in the implementation of the Governors Island Agreement.

My delegation therefore voted in favour of the resolution just adopted by the Security Council.

We regret that, for well-understood reasons, the Secretary-General could not recommend the option one contained in his report in document S/1994/828 of 15 July 1994. Had it been possible to implement that option, it would have been a preferred course of action, in my delegation's view.

We express the hope that the multinational force will be deployed for the shortest period necessary and will exercise the utmost caution and restraint in the fulfilment of its mandate, to avoid any loss of life.

The adoption of the present resolution not only sets the clock ticking on the illegal de facto regime in Haiti, but is also a warning to other States that are using their state apparatus to carry out systematic campaigns of gross violations of fundamental human rights and civil liberties, particularly where such violations give rise to tensions in the region and threaten regional peace and security.

I now resume my function as President of the Council.

There are no further names on the list of speakers. The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Security Council will remain seized of the matter.

The meeting rose at 2.25 p.m.